

5090  
Ser 1811GM/L3134  
6 Jan 1993

Mr. Tom Lanphar  
Department of Toxic Substances Control  
700 Heinz Avenue, Suite 200  
Berkeley, CA 94710

Subj: NAS ALAMEDA DECEMBER 10, 1992 MEETING MINUTES AT DEPARTMENT  
OF TOXIC SUBSTANCE CONTROL REGION 2

Enclosure (1) provides the minutes of our meeting held at your office on December 10, 1992.

If you have any questions regarding the minutes of the meeting, please contact either  
Mr. Gary J. Munekawa, Code 1811GM, (415) 244-2524 or Mr. George Kikugawa, Code  
1811GK (415) 244-2559.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

LOUISE T. LEW  
Head, Installation Restoration Section

Enclosure (1) Meeting Minutes

Copy to:

Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board (Attn: James Nusrala)  
PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (Attn: Duane Balch)  
James M. Montgomery Consulting Engineers, Inc. (Attn: Ken Leung)  
NAS Alameda (Attn: Lt. Mike Petouhoff)

Blind copy to:

1811, 1811GM, 1811GK  
09CMN, 0222LC, Admin Records (3 copies)  
Chron, blue, pink, green  
Writer: Gary J. Munekawa/1811GM/X-2524  
File: NAS Alameda

## NAS ALAMEDA MEETING - DECEMBER 10, 1992

**Attendees:** Tom Lanphar - Department of Toxic Substances Substances Control (DTSC)  
George Kikugawa - Navy Western Division (WESTDIV)  
Gary Munekawa - WESTDIV  
Kenneth Leung - James M. Montgomery Consulting Engineers (JMM)  
Kelli Shuter - JMM  
Patrick Casey - JMM

**Agenda:** 1. Funding  
2. Canonic data  
3. Phase 1&2A DSR  
4. IMF  
5. Other

### 1. FUNDING

As a result of a Navy DERA funding shortfall and the Navy's priority ranking system, RI/FS work at NAS Alameda is of relatively low priority and is not expected to receive any significant amounts of FY93 DERA funding to continue RI/FS work.

An FFSRA between the State and the Navy would put Alameda at a higher priority. However, DTSC indicated that it would not consider entering into an FFSRA instead of a RAO.

Tom Lanphar indicated that if work did not continue at NAS Alameda under the order, the DTSC would be required to issue a non-compliance order against NAS Alameda which may include penalty fees and a press release.

There has been no official word whether NAS Alameda would be on the NPL.

Current budget status for NAS Alameda under existing funds:

Currently, for Phases 1 and 2A, this work is over-budget. Until additional funding can be added, all work should cease.

Funding for Phases 5 & 6 work plan, but not the field work, has been approved (to be negotiated on December 17, 1992 and should be awarded in early January). The Navy may be able to conduct some Phase 5 & 6 additional field work under CTO 107, which has funding.

Funding for Phases 2B & 3 work plan, but not the field work, has been approved (to be negotiated on December 17, 1992 and should be awarded in early January). The Navy is unsure on how to conduct future Phases 2B & 3 additional field work.

Funding for Phases 1 & 2A work plan and field work have not been and may not be approved.

Funding for the free-product removal at the IMF comes under a different priority ranking and are already fully funded.

Phase 4 (Ecological Assessment) was awarded on December 7, 1992.

Funding for the RI/FS workplan revisions is approved and will be negotiated on December 17, 1992 and should be awarded by early January.

Additional field work for Phases 1 & 2A, 2B and 3, and 5 and 6 for RI/FS was scheduled to commence Spring/Summer 1993, if funding was available.

Recommendations discussed and supported by Tom Lanphar for improving the investigation and funding status of Phases 1 and 2A sites:

Include all further work at Sites 1 and 2 (Disposal Area and West Beach Landfill) under Phases 5 and 6.

Include further work at Site 4 (Building 360) under Phases 2B and 3 which included the Plating Shop inside of Building 360.

## 2. CANONIE DATA

The major issue is the usability of the Canonie data because it has not been independently validated. It is the Navy's understanding that DHS (now DTSC) gave tacit approval to the Canonie QAPP (Revised final -January 1990), which did not specify any independent data validation, only internal validation by the lab of all data.

A meeting, requested by the Navy, was held at the former Canonie Laboratory site in Stockton (now owned by Weston) on December 4, 1992 to assess what data and associated quality control (QC) data are available from the samples collected by Canonie for Phases 1 and 2A work. Canonie performed an internal data quality check on samples analyzed by Canonie and prepared data validation packages for about 5% of those data; subcontracted laboratories were not required to include any QA/QC data with the deliverable packages and therefore these data were checked only by the subcontracted laboratories. Furthermore, these data are not centrally located. To obtain associated QC data, the 12 subcontracted laboratories would have to search their own data files for the necessary data. This could potentially be a costly task because laboratories were not required to file QC data with the deliverable data and QC data may be stored separately, such as by date or instrument. In addition, it is uncertain whether the associated QC data exist at the subcontracted facilities. The status of some of the 12 subcontracted laboratories is not currently known.

Tom Lanphar will confer with other DTSC staff and provide a decision with regard to whether the data can be used and to what degree.

## 3. PHASES 1 & 2A DSR

JMM feels that, provided the Canonie data can be used, there is generally enough data to conduct the risk assessment. However, there are a few data gaps to be filled with an additional sampling effort.

Tom Lanphar had five general questions/observations to be considered with regard to the Canonie data:

1 - Does the data characterize the lateral and vertical extent of compounds of concern at each site?

2 - Is there enough data to conduct a risk assessment?

3 - Does the data meet the Data Quality Objectives?

4 - Groundwater characterization is incomplete (need tidal influence study, overall base-wide quality assessment, rather than site by site).

5 - Can data from previous studies be used? (need to review quality of data, i.e. well construction logs, etc.)

JMM indicated to Tom Lanphar that in general, these five questions have been addressed in the conclusions and recommendations that are presented in the Phases 1 and 2A DSR submitted to DTSC on December 2, 1992.

DTSC commends regarding site conclusions and recommendations:

DTSC agrees with approach to investigation of second water-bearing zone by using CPT and HydroPunch at several locations in each site to perform an initial evaluation of the depth and groundwater quality in this zone.

#### Sites 1 and 2

- DTSC is agreeable to probable transfer of these sites to Phases 5 & 6.
- HydroPunch at several locations in each site to perform an initial evaluation of the depth and groundwater quality in this zone.

#### Site 3

- Check usability of Wahler and Kennedy monitoring wells
- Apparent correlation between soil-gas contours and trench locations, consider additional soil work near trenches and soil-gas contours and in the peak soil-gas area
- Determine storm drain depth and direction of flow (a storm drain study was done within the last two years)

#### Site 4

- DTSC is agreeable to a possible transfer of this site to Phases 2B & 3
- Additional soil investigation be performed under building to identify potential source areas for VOCs in groundwater
- CPT/Hydropunch survey to evaluate water quality in the second water-bearing zone before installing deep wells

#### Site 7C

- Horizontal and vertical extent of compounds of concern are adequately defined with existing data
- Future field investigation will attempt to locate waste-oil tanks and pumps (if necessary, use geophysical methods)
- DTSC is agreeable to combining downgradient well with boring proposed at Site 13

#### Site 9

- DTSC agrees with recommendations

#### Site 10B

- DTSC agrees with conclusions that there is enough data for RI/FS
- DTSC agrees with possible inclusion of Site 10B as part of Site 13

#### Site 13

- DTSC agrees with recommendations
- DTSC agrees with another boring located south of BOR-26 to further evaluate Toxaphene found in the soil

#### Site 16

- DTSC agrees with conclusions and recommendations

#### Site 19

- DTSC agrees with conclusions and recommendations

### 4. IMF WORK

Gary Munekawa discussed comments made by Tom Lanphar on the scope of work prepared by the Navy for the free-product removal planned for the IMF site.

Tom Lanphar indicated that the workplan will not need to go through a formal review by DTSC, but that he would be willing to review and offer comments.

### 5. OTHER

Site visit to NAS Alameda re-scheduled on January 7, 1993 with DTSC and RWQCB.

Gary Munekawa provided Tom Lanphar a draft copy of the Scope of Work, Work Plan Addenda for Additional Field Work for Phases 1 and 2A for review.

A meeting was tentatively set for January 19, 9:00 AM at DTSC to discuss the scope of work proposed for Phases 2B, 3, 5 and 6.